

REMARKS

The paragraph numbering of the Office Action will be used.

1. Claims 5, 12 and 19 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite on the basis of lack of antecedent basis for “said plurality,”

Claims 5 and 12 have been amended at line 2, to change the usage “said plurality” to read “said plurality of subarrays.” The amended wording finds clear antecedent support at line 5 of claim 1 and line 4 of claim 8, the respective parent claims.

Claim 19 has been made dependent on claim 18 and amended at line 2, to delete the wording “of said plurality”.

Entry of the amendments to claims 5, 12 and 19 and reconsideration of the Section 112 rejection are requested.

6. Claim 21 was stated to be allowable if rewritten in appropriate independent form.

Claim 15 has been amended in two respects.

(I) Claim 21 has been presented in independent form by inserting into claim 15 all substantive wording of claim 21. Claim 15 (amended) thus represents former claim 21 rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 21 in its original dependent form is canceled.

(II) The exception to the foregoing is that the limitation “each said subarray including at least one waveguide section having slot-type radiating elements” and related references to “subarrays” have been deleted from claim 15, as considered to be unnecessary in view of the additional limitations from canceled claim 21 which have now

been added to claim 15 (amended).

Thus, former dependent claim 21 has now been placed in appropriate independent form, except that a limitation formerly present in claim 15 has been deleted. As now presented, claim 15 (amended) is considered to clearly distinguish over all known prior art, particularly as a result of the limitations taken from former claim 21.

Consideration and allowance of claim 15 (amended) are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 15-17 and 19 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,259,415 ("Kumpfbeck").

Applicant's cavity-mounted antenna system differs significantly from Kumpfbeck's radome-enclosed antenna system, in addition as discussed above claim 15 (amended) includes further distinguishing limitations taken from original claim 21.

Kumpfbeck does not disclose each element of claim 15 (amended) and reconsideration of the rejection of claim 15 is requested.

Claims 16, 17 and 19 would become allowable with allowance of claim 15 (amended).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 15-17 and 19, as amended, are requested.

5. Claims 18 and 20 were rejected under Section (103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumpfbeck in view of US Patent No. 5,579,019 ("Uematsu").

Claim 20 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 19.

Claims 18 and 20 would become allowable with allowance of claim 15 (amended).

SUMMARY


Claims 1-14 have been allowed and claim 21 was stated to be allowable if rewritten in appropriate independent form.

Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form and is now presented as claim 15 (amended). However, in addition to amending original claim 15 to insert all limitations of claim 21, original claim 15 has been amended to delete a limitation not considered to be necessary to patentability, as discussed above. Original claim 21 is canceled.

Claims 5 and 12 have been amended for purposes of clarification of the antecedent basis of a term used in the claims and that term has been deleted from claim 19.

Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of all rejections and allowance of claims 1-20, as amended, are respectfully requested. This application is now considered to be in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth P. Robinson
Attorney for Applicant

Signed: September 16, 2005

Reg. No.: 20,056
Tel. No.: (631) 385-3255

474 New York Avenue
Huntington, NY 11743